

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed 10/13/06 rejected all claims as anticipated by Kerven (US App. No. 20020042784). In view the amendment and arguments below, Applicant submits that Kerven cannot anticipate the claims and respectfully request allowance of all claims.

Kerven relates to systems and methods for locating references related to a target intellectual property item in one or more accessible information storage systems. In accordance with the present invention, one or more search terms associated with the target item are received. Where possible, the received terms are expanded to include variations of interest. The expanded search terms are used to conduct searches in the accessible information storage systems. The search results are accumulated in a search result set. A report based upon the search result set is generated and transmitted to an output device.

The Office Action asserted that

As per claims 1, 14-1 5, and 31, Kerven et al. teaches "receiving a search query for IP; identifying a plurality of IP documents responsive to the search query" (see paragraph [0015] and [0027]) "assigning a score to each document based on at least the citation information; and organizing the documents based on the assigned scores" (see paragraph [0027] and [0030]).

Applicant submits that, as amended, Kerven fails to show claim 1's receiving a search query for IP; identifying a plurality of IP documents responsive to the search query; assigning a score to each document based on at least the citation information and usage information including the number of users who have visited the document; and organizing the documents based on the assigned scores.

Also, as to new claim 17, Kerven fails to show the combination of receiving a

search query for IP; identifying a plurality of IP documents responsive to the search query; assigning a score to each document based on at least the citation information; organizing the documents based on the assigned scores; identifying each document whose score exceeds a predetermined threshold as a relevant document; and for each relevant document, downloading one or more page images from a patent image source and combining all page images of each relevant document into one patent document digitally stored in a device independent format including one of: a portable document format, an XML paper specification format.

Hence claims 1 and 17 are not anticipated by Kerven, and those dependent therefrom cannot be anticipated by Kerven as well. Withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection is requested.

In addition, Applicant has looked carefully at Kerven and cannot find that Kerven discloses claim 2's score is based on ratings by users who have visited the document; claim 3's score being based on the number of documents that hyperlink to the document; claim 4's usage information for a document comprises the change, over a period of time, in the number of users who have visited the document; claim 5's exclusion of certain predefined users; claim 6's usage information for a document is weighted based on the nature of user; claim 7's usage information for a document comprises the frequency with which the document has been visited; claim 8's usage information for a document comprises the change, over a period of time, in the frequency with which the document has been visited; claim 9's usage information for a document excludes certain predefined visits; claim 10's usage information for a document is weighted based on the nature of the visit; claim 11's usage information for a document comprises a combination of

unique visitors to the document and a frequency with which the document has been visited; claim 12's usage information is stored at a server that provides access to the documents.

Further, as to claim 13, Kerven fails to disclose the security aspect of claim 13 where usage information is stored at a client that accesses the documents. Kerven fails to disclose the specifics of claim 14 where the score assigned to a document is relative to the score assigned to other documents. Kerven fails to disclose claim 15's score assigned to a document is an absolute score. There is no mention of claim 16's usage information for a document comprises the number of unique visitors to the document. As to claim 21, Kerven does not show claim 22's organizing the documents based on the usage information and the link information or claim 23's organizing the documents based on usage statistics, the search query, and the link information. Kerven fails to disclose claim 24's usage information for a document is based on the usage information for the site to which the document belongs.

Additionally, Kerven does not teach or disclose claim 25's comprising performing a network analysis on the documents. As to claim 26, no where in Kerven does it show the specifics of:

- receiving as a query one or more keywords or assignees to be searched;
- searching the query in Issued Patent or Published Application databases;
- retrieving cited prior art patents for each patent found in search results;
- updating the query by adding assignees from the cited prior art patents; and
- running a second search using the updated query.

As to claim 27, the Office Action is silent on comparing with Kerven as Kerven does not show for each patent, creating spring relationship among patents based on number of citation of patent prior art; and generating a spring mass diagram.

Nowhere in Kerven does it teach claim 29's generating a visualization of the patents for display on a screen or plotting on a large format plotter. Further, Kerven is completely silent on claim 30's three-dimensionally visualizing the patents on a 3D display device.

As to claim 32, Kerven is silent on caching results from prior IP maps in a remote computer. As to claim 33, Kerven fails to teach retrieving a cached IP map in response to a user request.

As to claim 34, Kerven fails to teach a peer-to-peer search approach where the system distributes a search over a plurality of client computers. As to claim 35, Kerven fails to recognize the issue where one of the client computers is located behind a firewall and the solution by comprising bypassing the firewall in sending distributed search results to a remote computer. As to claim 36, Kerven fails to disclose the P2P approach of storing a patent at one or more local computers; and requesting the patent from one of the local computers in response to a request for the patent.

As to claim 38, Kerven is completely silent on generating search metadata by an independent agent using one of latent semantic indexing, Naïve Bayesian methods, decision trees, decision rules, regression modeling, the Perceptron method, the Rocchio method, using example-based methods, a support vector machine, classifier committees, or boosting.

As to claim 39, Kerven is also silent on generating a composite rating for a patent by category or by patent, using the generated search metadata. Similarly, as to claim 40, Kerven does not teach the use of multiple search agents using different search methodologies, each using a different set of generated search metadata.

In sum, Kerven fails to anticipate the independent claims, and further fails to teach the specifics recited in the dependent claims. For these reasons, Kerven cannot anticipate the claims. Allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 408-528-7490.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bao Tran", with a stylized, flowing script.

Bao Tran

Reg. No. 37,955

TRAN & ASSOCIATES
6768 Meadow Vista Court
San Jose, California 95135
Tel: 408-528-7490
Fax: 408-528-1490